

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-70 were pending. Applicants elected to pursue claims 21-70. Claim 21, 51, 58, 61, and 67 have been amended without adding any new matter. Claims 1-20, 43 and 62 have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 21-42, 44-61, and 63-70 remain pending.

The Applicants received a notice of non-compliant amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, mailed 7/18/2006, stating that the listing of claims does not include the text of all pending claims. Applicants have corrected the listing of claims. Therefore, the Applicants submit that present amendments and response comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-27, 29-39, 41-53, 55-58, and 60-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,526,037 of Cortjens et al. (hereinafter "Cortjens"). The Applicants respectfully disagree because Cortjens fails to describe each and every element claimed by the Applicants in claims 21-27, 29-39, 41-53, 55-58, and 60-70.

Cortjens describes a system and method where a central controller has device-specific software that it transfers to network converters that provide support for peripheral devices (Cortjens, column 2, line 56 to column 3, line 15). When a peripheral device (i.e., a mouse, joystick, etc.) connects to a network converter, a user specifies the device, and device-specific software is loaded onto the converter for the connected device (column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 15). When the controller receives a signal/command from an initiating device, intended to control a second device, the controller will perform device-to-device conversion of instructions from the initiating

device, such as a mouse, to the controlled device, such as a camera (Cortjens, column 3, lines 16-23; column 5, lines 55-59). However, the actions are converted by the controller and not the peripheral device, as the actions are not handled locally by the controlling device. Further, in the case of the device-to-device signal translation, a command from a first device is converted to a standard command, the standard command is then provided to the converter of the second device, and the converter reconstructs a device-specific command based on the device's specifics driver software (Cortjens, column 7, line 63 to column 8, line 27). Thus, Corjens merely describes a remotely handling events.

With respect to amended claim 21, the Applicants claim:

A user interface system allowing a user interface of a first device to be supported at least in part by a second device, the system comprising:
a module for generating at least one high-level event message indicating that an event has occurred that is relevant to the first device;
a router present at the first device for determining whether said at least one high-level event message is handled locally at the first device or remotely at the second device;
a mapper for mapping said at least one high-level message into at least one lower-level message for controlling one or more hardware elements controlled by the second device; and
a module for communicating said at least one lower-level message to the second device, such that the second device may activate one or more hardware elements that are appropriate for said event that has occurred.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Cortjens fails to describe each and every feature as claimed in claim 21. Cortjens only describes handling and converting a device-specific command of an initiating device before transmitting the instructions to a controlled device. Remotely converting and handling command signals, however, fails to describe "a router present at the first device for determining whether said at least one

high-level event message is handled locally at the first device or remotely at the second device," because remote signal conversion fails to teach or suggest local event-message handling. Therefore, Cortjens fails to describe each and every feature as claimed by the Applicants in Claim 21.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is not anticipated by Cortjens. Claims 22-27, 29-39, 41-50 depend on claim 21, and include additional features and limitations to those contained in claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 22-27, 29-39, 41-50 are also not anticipated by Cortjens. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 21-27, 29-39, 41-50 under § 102.

Similarly, amended claim 51 recites:

An interface system allowing a client device to be partially supported by a host device, the system comprising:
an onboard interface engine on the client device for generating at least one high-level event message indicating that an event has occurred on the client device;
a router in the client device to determine whether the at least one high level event message should be handled locally at the client device or remotely at the host;
a state transition table to transition to the new state based on the event; and
a module to update the client device's current state information;
and
a mapper for mapping said at least one high-level message into at least one lower-level message for controlling one or more hardware elements controlled by the second device.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 21, Cortjens fails to fails to teach or suggest local event-message handling. Rather, Cortjens merely translates a command function remotely to an intermediate form, which is then re-translated to a device-specific command function (Cortjens, column 5, lines 55-59; column 3, lines 16-53). Because

claim 51 claims “a router in the client device to determine whether the at least one high level event message should be handled locally at the client device or remotely at the host,” claim 51 is similarly not anticipated by Cortjens. Furthermore, claims 52, 53, 55-58, and 60-66 depend on claim 51, and include additional features and limitations. Thus, claims 52, 53, 55-58, and 60-66 are also not anticipated by Cortjens.

Claim 67 recites:

A method comprising:
receiving a notification at a first device, indicating that an event has occurred with respect to the first device;
determining whether the event should be handled locally at the first device or remotely at a second device;
transmitting a message to the second device, intended to activate a hardware element on the second device;
activating a hardware element on the second device, in response to the message.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 21, Cortjens describes remote device-to-device translation of command signals, where actions are not handled locally (Cortjens, column 5, lines 55-59; column 3, lines 16-53). Further, upon a controller observing a malfunctioning camera, the controller generates messages to be sent to printers, monitors, or system operators (Cortjens, column 9, lines 6-16). Thus, the controller of Cortjens fails to handle actions locally, and fails to teach or suggest “determining whether the event should be handled locally at the first device or remotely at a second device,” as claimed in claim 67. Therefore, Cortjens fails to anticipate claim 67. Claims 68-70 depend on claim 67, and include additional features and limitations. Thus, claims 68-70 are also not anticipated by Cortjens.

Claims 40 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,930,709 of Creamer et al. (hereinafter

"Creamer"). The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Cortjens and Creamer, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as claimed by the applicants in claims 40 and 59. As discussed above, with respect to independent claims 21 and 51, Cortjens fails to describe or suggest a router for determining if an action can be handled locally. Because Creamer merely describes a self-contained camera that can upload images or video directly to the internet based on user commands entered into the camera (Creamer, column 6, lines 29-58), Creamer also fails to describe or suggest the limitations discussed above with respect to claims 21 and 51. Therefore, Cortjens and Creamer, alone or in combination, fail to render claims 21 and 51, and thus dependent claims 40 and 59, obvious.


Claims 28 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,606,365 of Maurinus et al. (hereinafter "Maurinus"). The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Cortjens and Maurinus, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as claimed by the applicants in claims 28 and 54. As discussed above, with respect to independent claims 21 and 51, Cortjens fails to describe or suggest a a router for determining if an action can be handled locally. Because Maurinus merely describes a camera which wirelessly transmits raw image data to a separate image processing before transmitting the image to a home interface controller(Maurinus, column 8, lines 39-51; column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 19), Maurinus also fails to describe or suggest the limitations discussed above with respect to claims 21 and 51. Therefore, Cortjens and Maurinus, alone or in combination, fail to render claims 21 and 51, and thus dependent claims 28 and 54, obvious.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Judith Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 8/15/06



Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No. 39,393

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300